

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed on January 3, 2005. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004).

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004) in view of Cochrane et al (U.S. 6,532,470).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the following arguments.

Arguments

35 U.S.C. 102(a) Rejections

Claims 5-6 stand rejected as being anticipated by Rassen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claim 5 relates to a query for use by a database manager to extract information from a relational database. The claim recites, *inter alia*, that the query comprises a select clause in which a field is selected from one of a plurality of dimension tables using an alias. The alias indicates, by way of an alias table, the *value* of the selected field in the dimension table. For example, an alias table for a dimension table contains an alias (the key field value in the hub table used to index into the dimension table) for each value of the field of the dimension table referred to in the joining SQL statement, e.g. as disclosed in Applicants' specification at page 11, lines 5-10. The contents of the alias table are therefore determined by the fields referred to in the joining SQL statement. The select clause provides the advantage of avoiding processing time required for joining individual fields of the query. Instead, the alias table provides a comparison table by which a hub table can be analyzed according to specified query fields without joining fields in the query.

Rassen does not disclose or suggest these features of Applicants' claims. The Examiner cites Rassen at col. 41 to suggest that Rassen discloses an alias table as claimed by Applicants. Rassen at col. 41 is a recitation of a sample code for a datamart wherein a table is created for population with information regarding whether the field is contained in an aggregate that can be utilized for faster processing in the current query. Rassen at col. 41 does not disclose or suggest an *alias indicating the value of a selected field* in a dimension table by way of an alias table. Moreover, Rassen at col. 41 does not disclose or suggest a query comprising a select clause in which *a field is selected from one of the dimension tables using an alias*. Rassen at col. 41 only discloses a common join query with the exception that the select clause determines which fact table or query the selected query will run fastest against. The value of the selected field in the dimension table is retrieved from the dimension table or from a query as is common in the art. Thus, Rassen neither anticipates nor renders obvious Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in claims 5-6.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Rassen in view of Cochrane. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with reference to the 102(a) rejection, Rassen does not disclose or suggest an alias that indicates the *value of the selected field in the dimension table*. Cochrane also does not disclose or suggest this feature of Applicants' claims. The Examiner has cited Cochrane at col. 17 lines 1-10 as disclosing "An alias table is created." Cochrane clearly identifies that the alias or "nickname" is assigned to the summary table (Cochrane at col. 8, line 46-47). The nickname is transmitted to a catalog and stored there with other information regarding the contents of the database including lists of tables, the nature of the data stored in the table, the particular schema used in each table and a description of each summary table's schema and contents (Cochrane at col. 8, lines 47-54). Therefore, the catalog includes general information regarding summary tables of a database including a nickname for the summary table, but does not disclose or suggest *an alias table including each value of the field ... and also*

including an alias value for each value of the field ... the alias table thereby providing a table of alias field values and corresponding aliased field values. Nor, do Rassen or Cochrane taken alone or in combination disclose or suggest *transforming the joining query into a reduced query in which the aliased field values are replaced by the alias values*, as set forth in Applicants' claims 1 and 7.

In Applicants' invention, the value is, for example, a value of the field of the dimension table referred to in the joining SQL statement, e.g. as disclosed in Applicants' specification at page 11, lines 5-10. This means that the alias table as described in Applicants' claims includes at least *a value of a field of a dimension table* referenced by a joining SQL statement. Since the prior art does not disclose or suggest an alias table including a value of a selected field in a dimension table, Applicants' claims are not anticipated and not obvious. If Cochrane were combined with Rassen, as suggested by the Examiner, the result would be a modified query capable of determining which of a number of tables, including summary tables, preprocessed queries, a catalog, or other standard SQL tables is optimal for performing a join query. Such a combination would not result in Applicants' claimed structure or methods.

Applicants' claim 10 relates to the provision of aliases instead of actual values for leaf nodes of a relational database. Replacing a value from the leaf node with an alias is similar to creating an alias table including a value of a field from a dimension table for a database of a different structure. Such a method is also novel and unobvious over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, Applicants' independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 10 and each of the claims dependent thereon are clearly patentable over the cited references. There is simply no disclosure, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art to provide, for example, a select clause in which a field is selected from one of the dimension tables using an alias, the alias indicating, by way of an alias table, the value of the selected field in the dimension table as claimed by Applicants. Nor, is there any disclosure, suggestion or motivation to provide, *inter alia*, an alias that indicates the value of a selected field in a dimension table, or an alias table including (i) each value of the field and (ii) an alias value for each value of the field, so that the alias table can provide a table of alias field values and corresponding aliased field values. Still further, there is no disclosure,

suggestion or motivation in the prior art to transform a joining query into a reduced query in which the aliased field values are replaced by the alias values, or to provide aliases instead of actual values for leaf nodes of a relational database..

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicants' claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended drawings and the foregoing discussion. Applicants' silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the present application, allow each of the pending claims, and to pass this application on to issue. If there are any remaining matters that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Barry R. Lipsitz
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 28,637
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No.: IMRS-364
Date: March 31, 2005